

BACONIANA.

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1914. No. 48.

THE DATE OF NEW YEAR'S DAY.

TO those who study 16th and 17th century Baconian literature, much trouble is often caused by the non-recognition of the date formerly used in various countries for New Year's day, and the consequent difference of year that ensued. Up to the year 1566 all European countries (I think) agreed upon March 25th as New Year's Day. Upon that day the year changed. This day continued in use in England until 1752, when the change to January 1st was made. But in France January 1st was adopted as New Year's Day in 1566, and in Scotland, King James VI. and his Council ordained, on December 17th, 1599, that on and after January 1st, 1600, the year should begin on January 1st, instead of March 25th.* The confusion arising from this is very curious. A letter dated in France, "Feb., 1590," would correspond to "Feb., 1589," in England or Scotland ;

* I am indebted to M. Abel Le Franc, of the College de France and the Sorbonne for the French date, and to Sir James Balfour Paul, Lyon King, of the Scottish Heraldic College, for the Scotch date. I presume this information can be found in some English book of reference, but I know not where: even the omniscient Whitaker has not got it.

whereas if dated "Feb., 1590" in England or Scotland, it would correspond to "Feb., 1591" in France. But a letter dated "Feb., 1601" in France would correspond to the same date in Scotland, but to "Feb., 1600" in England.

In "A Concordancie of Years," by Arthur Hopton, printed by the Stationers' Company in London, of which I have an edition of 1616, there are remarks about the change of the year. After the manner of the time, Hopton plunges into a very classical disquisition on the subject, but does not give any practical information about the custom of our neighbour countries. But he says (pp. 66-7), "The Astronomers begin their year ye first of Januarie and so do we take it vulgarly in England. But ye Church of England and the date of all writings, and such like, hath their yeare to begin upon the 25th day of March."

I fancy that the confusion of this date was made worse by the fact that, as Hopton casually mentions, "we take it vulgarly in England" for the first day of January, and therefore we may sometimes have letters and even documents dated "vulgarly" without our knowing it, and years inextricably involved. This, I should think, was apt to be the case when writing to and from Scotland, or when going there, between January 1st and March 25th.

In Hopton's own book it is significant to note that he places the month of January as the commencing month of the year and not the month of March.

In the "Shepherd's Calendar," that came out anonymously in 1579, and was reproduced in four subsequent editions, up to 1597, all anonymous, the month of January is likewise placed first. At the beginning of the book there is a "General Argument," in which, quite in the Baconian style, the pros and cons are set forth for commencing the

year in January or March, and the writer expends much classical learning on the subject; and directs attention to the fact that Numa Pompilius called the month "January," as being "*Janua anni*," the gate of the year. And so the author of the Calendar "thinketh fit, according to the simplicitie of common understanding, to beginne with Januarie." I presume that the expression, "simplicite of common understanding," is the precursor of Hopton's phrase "do take it vulgarly in England," noted above. The writer is himself plainly in favour of January as the commencing month of the year, and without forcing his opinion upon his readers, puts this forward as the wisest and soundest position to adopt. This is quite in the manner that Bacon followed throughout his career. "*Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci*," as his favourite motto set out. Of course, my opinion, as I showed in my little book, "*Bacon's Secret Disclosed*,"* is that the "*Shepherd's Calendar*" was by Bacon and not Spenser, and that when he was only 18 years of age, it was the first of his many publications. This very Baconian disquisition of the beginning of the year is strongly confirmatory of Bacon's authorship. I am glad to see, also, in the latest book on Spenser,† that the author, Mr. Harman, is quite confident that Bacon was the author of the "*Shepherd's Calendar*."

A very curious and confusing consequence of March 25th, New Year's Day, is to be seen in the book entitled, "*Herbert's Travels in the East*."

Sir Thomas Herbert (b. 1606, d. 1682) sailed in the suite of Sir Dodmore Cotton, accredited Ambassador to the King of Persia, in the East Indiaman,

* Gay and Bird, 1911.

† Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Bacon, by C. E. Harman, C.B. London: Constable and Co., Ltd. 1914.

The Rose, for Gombrun, in the Persian Gulf. He afterwards published an account of his travels, the first edition (folio) was in 1634 the second in 1638 and there were subsequent editions.* I picked up the second edition (1638) a few years ago, a handsome folio of 364 pages, containing many illustrations, the opening page of Books I. and III. being headed by the well-known "archer emblem"; while the letter at the head of Book I. is: "Travels Begun Anno 1626, Describing Divers Parts of Africk and Asia the Great," &c.

On page 2 his embarkation at Dover is mentioned in the following manner:

In the margin the year "1626" is noted, then he goes on to say, "Upon Good Friday, we took ship at Dover, having six great and well man'd ships along with us."

Remembering that Bacon's death was said to have taken place on Easter Sunday, April 9th, 1626, I was naturally interested to come upon a date—Good Friday, 1626—so close to that great event, and read on, hoping that some allusion to the great Bacon might, perchance, occur, as allusions to Bacon in the literature of his period are so rare and in such unlooked for places. My hopes in this respect were not fulfilled, but three or four lines further down Herbert says, the wind, "blew us the third day (double solemniz'd by being the feasts of Mother and Son) upon the Lizard's point or lands ends of England. . . . The wind blew fair, so as the seven and twentieth day we entred the Spanish Ocean, the Coast of Biscay neighbouring us."

So far everything seemed clear, and Herbert and his friends, having spent Easter Sunday at Lands End, on the 27th of the month entered the Spanish

* Dictionary of National Biography.

Ocean ; from the 9th to the 27th was certainly a considerable time from Lands End to the Bay of Biscay, but then there is no information given of the number of days delayed by contrary winds, or so forth, at Lands End. A few lines lower down, however, after he has indulged in a quotation from Horace, and given an English translation of it in verse, he says: "In thirty hours the quarrell twixt wind and sea was ended, and joy in a serene sky reanimated us, so as wee ended March in chase of a Turkish Pirate, whom, with top-gallant top-sailes we pursued six houres, but (to our grieve) he outsailed us. The first of April we cut our passage into the vast Atlantic Ocean."

Here was indeed a complication ; when I had thought that they had spent Sunday, April 9th, at Lands End, it seems that after all the sailing, and Pirate chasing, they had done, they had only ended March, and on April 1st passed into the great Atlantic Ocean. Plainly there was something very crooked about those dates and the usual refuge of the puzzled, that it was "a misprint," would not serve to straighten out the tangle, for Herbert's account was too circumstantial for that. So I had recourse to Almanacks, and found that Easter Sunday, 1626, was truly on April 9th ; the next Easter Sunday came on March 25th which would be New Year's Day of 1627 (old style), and the Good Friday corresponding to this was on March 23rd, and this day was in 1626 (old style). So we have the curious complication that in the year 1626 there were two Good Fridays, the first on April 7th, and the second on March 23rd. And therefore when Herbert says that he and his company took ship at Dover, on Good Friday, 1626, this might be either April 7th, 1626, or March 23rd following in what we would call 1627, and as a matter of fact it

was the latter date. But unless one had looked to this date very carefully one would have gone on with the impression that Herbert had begun his journey in 1626, and had continued from that year; whereas he did not sail until March 23rd, 1627.

Thus it is that many dates in the past have been inextricably confused, and a man has been supposed to have gone to a place in a certain year—and this vouched for by writings—whereas in reality it was a year later—or earlier.

I think the late change in England to January 1st as New Year's Day, accounts for the non-observance of the entry of the New Year as a general holiday. When March 25th was New Year's Day, its proximity to—and often identity with—Easter, made the Easter holiday absorb any New Year's holiday making that might have been thought of. But in Scotland the abandonment of Church days upon the incoming of the Reformation, caused New Year's Day, January 1st, to be taken up warmly, and it has remained a great day there ever since. In France "*le jour de l'An*" has for long been a great day of rejoicing, but I imagine it must have been taken up only after January 1st was adopted. It is curious that in England it has never become a holiday. Being too close to Christmas is probably the reason. Christmas has never been a great holiday—*i.e.*, day of no work, but of jollification—in France; and Christmas being a Church festival was "taboo" in Presbyterian Scotland. Therefore in both these countries January 1st came as a "boon and a blessing."

GRANVILLE C. CUNNINGHAM.

STRATFORD AND ST. ALBANS.

A CONTRAST.

STRATFORD-ON-AVON has all the appearance of a prosperous shrine. Scores of thousands of pilgrims annually resort there to visit the "birthplace," the Shakespeare bust and gravestone in the chancel of the church, the Memorial Theatre, Library, and Picture Gallery, and the many places associated with the actor-author tradition.

The income from the show places is most substantial. Buildings that but for the poet's birthplace assumption would have been swallowed in the ruin of time, have been carefully preserved and illustrate the old half timber work of Elizabethan times.

Caretakers, vergers, guides were all absolutely assured that England's great Poet and Dramatist was the man player born, died and buried at Stratford-on-Avon. It was anathema to doubt, question, or disbelieve.

Nay, to do so was alien to the spirit of the place. Rare doubting Thomases of the reading public could there obtain relief from mental hesitations, just as sufferers from bodily rheums benefit at Bath or Buxton. A friend once assured me that all his doubts had been effectually dispelled by what he saw and heard at Stratford. "*My boy, the people there have got the documents and have absolutely assured me there is no question that the actor wrote the plays.*"

From that date my friend ceased to worry over the postulations of misguided, self-illuding Baconians.

Subsequently, when I in my turn went to Stratford, there seemed just a slight indication that the position was considered to be somewhat less sound and that the authorities were preparing a strategic position in their rear. Francis Bacon's works were on sale in

a case in the Library, and his engraved portrait (though not mentioned in the official guide) was hung in the Picture Gallery! *Verbum sap.*

THE ST. ALBAN'S SHRINE.

Here the Abbey Church was *the only centre of interest* to visiting strangers.

Should any casual antiquary seek the ruins of old Gorhambury House he must apply to the kindly agent of the Gorhambury Estate. After a long drive to the park surrounding the modern mansion an iron hurdle has to be temporarily moved, and the way is over grass to the right of the mansion. There is no defined path. Pilgrims have not been numerous enough to tread one. At length on high ground we came upon a small ruin of crumbling stone, slightly held together by iron bands and supports.

This, then, was all that was left of the famous mansion which once afforded rest, shelter and recreation to Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, and his friends.

His expectation of this result is finely expressed in one of the poems he, as a disappointed young man, put out in the name of Spenser (the one time sizar of Pembroke College, who accompanied Earl Grey de Wilton to Ireland in 1580 as a clerk).

"THE RUINES OF TIME."

"Verlame I was. What boots it that I was
Sith now I am but weedes and wastfull gras.

* * * *

Why then dooth flesh a bubble glas of breath
Hunt after honour and advancement vaine
And reare a trophee for devouring death

With no great labour and long lasting paine
As if his daies for ever should remaine ?

Sith all that in this world is great or gaie
Dooth as a vapour vanish and decaie."

Bacon used the same thoughts in his "Shakespeare" plays, and in the one poem, "Life is a Bubble," ascribed to his authorship.

After the ruins we visited the little church of St. Michael, alleged to contain Bacon's ashes. The church was locked, and only after calling at two or three houses were we able to obtain the key.

There in the chancel, in a position corresponding to that of the Shakespeare bust in Stratford Church, is the fine large marble statue of our great poet philosopher.

Like some massive effigy of Budha upon a lonely Eastern mountain, the Bacon statue dominates the little church so effectively as to make it seem to be merely a private shrine. There sits, solemn, thoughtful, dignified and patient the sculptured counterpart of England's superman; waiting—waiting—waiting—for the fame which he postulated should only come to a man after death.

He trusted to his "powerful rhyme."

"For deeds doe die how ever noblie donne
And thoughts of men do as themselves decay,
But wise words taught in numbers for to runne
Recorded by the Muses live for ay."

PARKER WOODWARD.

"SHAKESPEARE AND ASBIES."

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

SIR,—In your July number, Mr. Harold Hardy gave a criticism of my paper on this subject, which is occasionally misleading. He implies that I use Halliwell-Phillipps' work without acknowledgment, and do not "add" to it, whereas I only criticise his facts, and expand them through further and fuller information. On the other hand, I do not claim to have discovered the document in the State papers, which places John Shakespeare among "the gentlemen and freeholders of Warwickshire," 1850. I only pointed out that "none of the Baconians seem to have noted it," as the chief of them repeat that the poet was "an illiterate peasant lad," which does not harmonize with this synchronous classification of his father. I fancied that I did understand the legal technicalities connected with the transfer of land and "the levying of a fine," through the many thousands of cases I had analysed, though I would not call the seller "defendant" as Mr. Hardy does, but "deforciant." I am aware of the steps that Edmund Lambert made John Shakespeare take to secure him, but they were quite consistent with the processes of a mortgage, and the story John Shakespeare afterwards tells (which I am inclined to believe, after a careful study of the papers).

Mr. Hardy does not seem to have realised the meaning of the repeated "proclamations" which I pointed out.

I cannot conceive how he can attempt to deny my simple statement that William Shakespeare's name was first written in *London* in the "*Coram Rege* Rolls," and first spoken in the Law Courts, whether the case proceeded or not. I put my words in italics because

the Baconians are in the habit of asking the question :
 " Where could Shakespeare have learnt his law ? "

Mr. Hardy occasionally uses terms very loosely, as when he speaks of John Shakespeare's "*other indiscretion*," without having, even distantly, alluded to his previous "*indiscretion*," which was an important discovery of mine bearing on the causes of John's money difficulties at the time. I do *not*, as my critic would suggest, sympathise with John Shakespeare in relation to the story, but with his wife and his son.

Finally, Mr. Hardy finds fault with a suggestion which he attributes to me, that William Shakespeare was a descendant of the Beauchamps. I had really said that the Park Hall Ardens had intermarried with the Beauchamps (which their pedigree shows), and I have elsewhere collected my materials for my logical inference, that the Wilnecote Ardens had descended from the Park Hall Ardens, which were the "*historic family*" to which I referred. They themselves acknowledge the connection. It is curious that Mr. Hardy should, after all, acknowledge in conclusion what I had started to prove, the connection between Asbies and the course of Shakespeare's life.

I am, Yours faithfully,

CHARLOTTE C. STOPES.

The proof of the foregoing letter was submitted to Mr. Harold Hardy, who sends the following reply thereto.

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged for the copy of Mrs. Stopes' letter, and for the opportunity of adding a reply. It is a matter of small importance whether Mrs. Stopes' articles on "*Shakespeare and Asbies*," purported to "*add*" to the facts contained in the documents published by Mr. Halliwell-Phillips, or

whether the writer claims only to criticise those facts, as Mrs. Stopes says, "and expand them through further and fuller information." I still maintain—and there is nothing in Mrs. Stopes' letter to alter the opinion—that on the subject of "Shakespeare and Asbies," Mrs. Stopes, who has evidently been industrious in her researches, adds very little to our information, and so far as criticism is concerned, her inferences are unconvincing and misleading.

Mrs. Stopes now tells us that the purpose of her articles was to prove the connection between Asbies and the course of Shakespeare's life. That is certainly a harmless theme. But it is impossible for anyone to read her articles without being impressed with the writer's evident desire to convey the opinion that, in the litigation relating to Asbies between the Shakespeares and John Lambert, the latter was entirely in the wrong and that the Shakespeares were very harshly treated.

The object of my article was to show that there is another side to the story; and from the documentary evidence it appears that the litigation promoted by the Shakespeares was vexatious, and never ought to have been instituted. The first action brought by the Shakespeares, which was based upon allegations of fraud, was not proceeded with; the second proceeding was dismissed with costs; and the third was abandoned. No wonder Mrs. Stopes now frankly admits that she does not sympathise with John Shakespeare in relation to the story. But if William Shakespeare as the heir apparent of John Shakespeare was a party to the action—"probably instructed the attorneys, and did all the personal duties of a complainant," as Mrs. Stopes imagines—it is difficult to understand why she should have more sympathy with the son than with the father, in respect of the same vexatious litigation.

The bias of Mrs. Stopes is apparent throughout her articles. It is clearly indicated by such phrases as the following :—

“ Again John Shakespeare trusted his brother-in-law’s word.”

“ And again the Shakespeares trusted a Lambert’s word.”

In fact Mrs. Stopes treats all the allegations made by the Shakespeares in the pleadings as if they were true ; while she ignores the allegations of John Lambert, which are far more likely to be correct, because the story put forward by the Shakespeares is highly improbable and their litigation was undoubtedly a hopeless failure.

I don’t know whether these failures in litigation suggest to Mrs. Stopes that the Shakespeares’ attorney was well versed in the law, but it is clear that she thinks they are to be taken as evidence of a knowledge of law on the part of the lay client. This is the inference of Mrs. Stopes—two actions abandoned and one dismissed with costs, and all relating to the same bogus claim, indicate clearly how William Shakespeare acquired the knowledge of law which permeates the works that bear his name.

In spite of the protest in Mrs. Stopes’ letter, I cannot understand why she persists in her “ simple ” statement that the name of William Shakespeare was first spoken in London in the Law Courts, merely because he was plaintiff in an action which never came into court. This is only one of the inferences which I have ventured to describe as unconvincing and misleading.

Here is another inference of the same class. Mrs. Stopes says :—

“ Shakespeare found work at the theatre, seems to have been liberally treated, though at first servitor or

apprentice, and soon had a home in Bishopsgate Street, on which he was assessed higher than either of the Burbages," and then follows this amazing proposition, "*So it may reasonably be inferred he had his family with him at least by 1594 for a time.*" This is surely a novel suggestion, that William Shakespeare's wife and children came to London from Stratford and lived with the player in Bishopsgate Street.

I have already called attention in my July article to the erroneous inference drawn by Mrs. Stopes from the entry, which she quotes as showing that the depositions of the witnesses were in favour of the Shakespeares. It is sufficient, therefore, to say that Mrs. Stopes has not even attempted to give any explanations of her mistake.

As to Mrs. Stopes' captious comment that I used the word "defendant" instead of "deforciant," I should have thought it was obvious to anyone from the context that I was explaining, in what lawyers call popular language, the technicalities of "levying a fine"; and as the word "defendant" is commonly known, it was preferred to the word "deforciant," which may not be so familiar to everybody. But, apart from that, to show how paltry is the criticism, I may add that the words "defendant" and "plaintiff" are used in this very connection in "Stephen's Commentaries"; and, if the learned author of that work had not analysed many thousands of cases, as Mrs. Stopes claims to have done, he at any rate knew what he was writing about.

And now may I appeal to Mrs. Stopes to enlighten us, by explaining the importance she attaches to "the repeated proclamations"? In her article in the "Athenæum," she mentions fifteen proclamations. I don't know whether this is a slip, but the usual number was sixteen, that is to say, four times in four successive terms.

There is only one other matter—Mrs. Stopes complains that I mentioned John Shakespeare’s “other indiscretion” without having alluded to his previous indiscretion. Now, it appears from Mrs. Stopes’ researches that “John Shakespeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, yeoman,” was fined a sum of £20 for failing to appear on a summons to be bound over to keep the peace; and a further fine of £20 was imposed upon him for failing in his obligation as a surety. This is what Mrs. Stopes describes as an important discovery, and she glories in having brought it to light. But if a Baconian had made such a dive into the murky past of John Shakespeare, there can be no doubt that the orthodox Shakespearean would have instantly cried out about throwing mud at the historic family, which was listed among “the Gentlemen and Freeholders of Warwick.” Mrs. Stopes expresses herself rather vaguely, but she realises that the affair was not very creditable. She says:—

“Whether he did not appear as a defendant or as witness in some case when summoned, or whether he had committed some trespass, or had had a free fight with someone . . . I have not been able to prove.”

Someday, perhaps, we shall get something more illuminating.

HAROLD HARDY.

“ THE GOLDEN METTLE OF THEIR SOLDIERS.”

SIR WALTER RALEIGH'S “ History of the World ” is most profitable ground for Baconian study, and in the course of browsings thereon, I have found not only the extremely Shake-Spearian line which heads this article, but also so much germane to the matter absorbing Britain at present—our soldiers and their gallantry—that I can but set it down.

“ It is not my purpose to disgrace the Roman valour (which was very noble) or to blemish the reputation of so many famous victories. I am not so idle. This I say : that among all their wars, I find not any wherein their valour hath appeared comparable to the English. If my judgment seems over partial, our wars in France may help to make it good. . . . Let us generally compare with the deeds done by the best of Roman soldiers in their principal service, the things performed in the same country by our common English soldiers levied in haste from following the cart, or sitting on the shop-stall, so shall we see the difference.”

If any man ask how then came it to pass that the English won so many great battles, having no advantage to help him ? I may, with best commendation of modesty refer him to the French historian, who relating the victory of our men at *Crevant* when they passed a bridge in face of the enemy had these words :

“ The English comes with a conquering bravery as he that was accustomed to gain everywhere without any stay.”

“ Great odds in weapon gave to the *Romans* the honours of many gallant victories. What such help ? or what other worldly help than the golden mettle of their soldiers had our English Kings ?

All that have read of *Cressi* and *Agincourt* will bear me witness that I do not alledge the Battle of *Poitiers*, for lack of other, as good examples of the English virtue, the proof whereof hath left a hundred better marks in all quarters of France than ever did the valour of the Romans.”

In speaking of our Kings, Raleigh’s History says :—

“Who so notes their proceedings may find that none of them went to work like a Conqueror save only Henry V.”

It has much to say about that King, and gives us words of Captain Gam, the Davy Gam, Esquire, of Shake-Speare [Henry V., A. IV., S. VIII.] spoken to the King before Agincourt, with this comment of his own : “Such words as these are not without their moment.” Throwing light on why Davy Gam, Esquire, was honoured by special mention in the great play. There seems little doubt that much of the “History of the World” known as Raleigh’s, if not all, was Francis Bacon’s work. Certainly the Play of Henry V. bears many signs of being written by the same hand as the History called Raleigh’s. Take for instance the idea of Thanksgiving,* such a salient point in them and Bacon. “There is a foolish and wretched pride where-with men being transported can ill endure to ascribe to God the honour of their actions in which it has pleased Him to use their own industry, courage or foresight. Therefore it is commonly seen that they who entering into battle are careful to pray for aid from Heaven, with due acknowledgment of His power, Who is the giver of victory, when the field is won do vaunt of their own exploits, one telling how he got such a ground advantage, another how he gave check to such a battalion ; a

* “Concerning the Liturgy . . . that it consist as well of lauds and hymns and Thanksgivings as of petitions.”—Francis Bacon “Of the Church.”

third how he seized on the enemy's canon, everyone striving, to magnify himself, whilst all forget God, as one that had not been present in the action. . . . This is true that as he which findeth better success than he did or in reason might expect, is deeply bound to acknowledge God the Author of his happiness, so he whose meer wisdom and labour hath brought things to a prosperous issue is doubly bound to show himself thankful both for the victory and for those virtues by which the victory was gotten, and indeed so far from weaknesses the nature of such Thanksgiving, that it may well be called the height of magnanimity ; no virtue being so truly heroical as that by which the spirit of man advanceth itself with confidence of acceptance unto the love of God;"—[p. 319, II. Book.]

The counterpart of this attitude of mind we find in *Henry V.* "The Mirror of all Christian Kings." Act. II., S. II.

King : "Let us deliver our puissance into the hand of God, putting it straight in expedition."

"We are in God's hand brother, not in theirs."

Act. III., S. VII.

"O God of battles ! Steal my soldier's hearts ! Possess them not with fear ! . . . Pluck their hearts from them not to-day, O Lord !"

"You know your places. God be with you all."

and *after* the battle, Act. IV., S. 7, 8, note this :—

"Praised be God, and not our strength for it !"

"O God, Thy arm was here, and not to us but to Thy arm alone ascribe we all. . . Take it God ! For it is only Thine !"

"Come, go we in procession to the Village ; and be it death . . . to boast of this or take that praise from God which is His only."

"God fought for us . . . Do we all holy rites ; let there be sung *Non nobis* and *Te Deum*."

Raleigh's History, with its praise of *Henry V.*, lest

it “ flies too high over men’s heads,” was followed up by the Play of *Henry V.*: “ I have a purpose,” says Bacon to James I., “ to draw it (this lesson) to the sense by some patterns of a natural story, (for) the general good of men in their very being, and in the dowries of nature, and . . . in society.”

“ The platform draws on the building,” imitating, as he tells us, Seneca, “ who spent his time in writing books of excellent argument and use for *all ages*.” Thus Shake-Speare, our own “ *Brand* or burning Torch,*” enlighteneth the whole circuit of the earth.”

Shake-Speare and Raleigh both bring Talbot into prominence.

“ The English virtue of the Lord John Talbot, Viscount Lisle, son to that famous Earl of Shrewsbury, who died in the battle of *Chastillon* ” is, as the History tells us: “ highly to be honoured.”

“ Talbot was in the flower of his youth, unhurt, easily able to have escaped and not answerable for that day’s misfortune when he refused to forsake his father who exhorted this his noble son to be gone and leave him.”

How Shake-Speare valued the valorous name of Talbot we may judge by the fact that he mentions it seventy-four times !

Both the History and Play of *Henry V.* had a special purpose in view, the education of Prince Henry, and the development in him of the valour and virtue of his namesake. Francis’ hope of seeing him a second Henry V., to quote the History’s words on that king, “ it pleased God to interrupt by his death.”

Francis Bacon, in his own name, gives us most suggestive remarks on war and “ its sinews ” in his *King Henry VII.* That king, he says, with “ wisdom admirable,” ordered “ All houses of husbandry

* Bacon’s “ Wisdom of the Ancients.”

216 "The Golden Mettle of their Soldiers."

with twenty acres of ground and upwards should be maintained and kept up for ever. . . By this means the houses did of necessity enforce a dweller not to be a beggar (but) might keep hinds and servants and set the plough on going. This did wonderfully concern the might and mannerhood of the kingdom . . . and did in effect amortise a great part of the lands of the kingdom unto the hold and occupation of the *yeomanry* . . . Now how much this did advance the military power of the kingdom is apparent by the true principles of other kingdoms. . . . The principal strength of an army consisteth in the Infantry or Foot, and to make good Infantry it requireth men *bred* . . . in some free and plentiful manner. Therefore if a State run most to noblemen and gentlemen and that the husbandmen and ploughmen be but as . . . mere cottagers . . . you may have good Cavalry, but never profitable good stable bands of foot . . . Thus did the King secretly sow Hydra's teeth, whereupon should rise up armed men for the service of the kingdom."

He also besides this draws attention to the want of Yeomanry in France and its bad effect on the Army. How perfectly are these truths accentuated in the play *Henry V.*, whose "*Hydra-headed* wilfulness so soon was lost."

King : On, on, yon noblest English,
 And yon good *yeomen* show us here
 The *mettle* of your pasture ; let us swear
 That you are worth your *breeding* ; which
 I doubt not. For there is none of you so mean and
 base
 That hath not noble **lustre* in your eyes."
 Act. II., S. I.

* Lustre is used together with *mettle* by Raleigh in his war passages.

Hoping to attack the question of Raleigh's “ History of the World ” at greater length on some future occasion, I close, adding some significant words :]

“ We, I say, ought to acknowledge that no Nations are wholly aliens and strangers the one to the other . . . Now if there be such a . . . league . . . sure it is not idle; It is against somewhat, or something: Who should they be? Is it against wild beasts? Or the elements of fire and water? No, it is against such Routs and Shoals of People as have utterly degenerate from the Laws of Nature; As have in their very Body and frame of Estate a Monstrosity; and may be truly accounted . . . common enemies and grievances of mankind; Or disgraces and reproaches to human nature. Such people, all nations are interested, and ought to be resenting, to suppress.” Francis Bacon, Of an Holy War.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

"THE DARK LADY."

(SONNETS 127-142).

"Black is the badge of hell."—*Love's Labour Lost*, IV, 3.

SHAKESPEARE, finding that "Time's injurious hand" has been at work upon his features, turns his thoughts to death. He would be gone from worldly vanities, "save that, to die, I leave my love alone" (*Sonnet* 66). The thought "that Time will come and take my love away," is, he says, "as a death," and he resolves to take comfort in his determination "to fortify against confounding age's cruel knife," by building an eternal monument of the conceptions of his brain, and under such a tomb will he hide. (*Sonnet* 17). He strives for the immortality of this "better part," and is regardless of personal fame : —

"From hence your memory death cannot take,
Although in me each part will be forgotten,
Your name from hence immortal life shall have,
Though I, once gone, to all the world must die ;
The earth can yield me but a common grave,
When you entombed in men's eyes shall lie,
Your monument shall be my gentle verse,
Which eyes, not yet created, shall o'er-read."

—*Sonnet* 81.

"When I perhaps compounded am with clay,
Do not so much as my poor name rehearse :
But let your love even with my life decay."—*Sonnet* 71.

"My name be buried where my body is."—*Sonnet* 72.

"Upon thy side against myself I'll fight,
And prove thee virtuous, though thou art forsworn.
With my own weakness being best acquainted,
Upon thy part (i.e. against myself) I can set down a story
Of faults concealed, wherein I am attainted ;
That thou, in losing me, shalt win much glory ;

And I by this will be a gainer too ;
For, bending all my loving thoughts on thee,
The injuries that to myself I do,
Doing thee vantage, double-vantage me.”—*Sonnet 88.*

But something comes between the poet and the “beauteous and lovely youth” (his Muse). In *Sonnets 97-119*, he reproaches himself with an “absence” from him, and poignantly laments :—

“Alas, ’tis true, I have gone here and there,
And made myself a motley to the view,
Gor’d mine own thoughts, sold cheap what is most dear,
Made old affections of offences new.”

He chides Fortune,—the cause of his absence, and “the guilty goddess of my harmful deeds—that she did not better for my life provide than public means which public manners breed.” His name has received “a brand,” and “vulgar scandal” is stamped upon his brow. The experiences, endured in this absence, have tormented his soul and led him, as it were, into hell itself :—

“What potions have I drunk of Syren tears,
Distill’d from limbecs foul as *hell* within,
Applying fears to hopes, and hopes to fears,
Still losing when I saw myself to win !
What wretched errors hath my heart committed,
Whilst it hath thought itself so blessed never !
How have mine eyes out of their spheres been fitted
In the distraction of this madding fever.”

It would seem that he went about in fear of his life for, in *Sonnet 74*, he imagines that “when that fell arrest without all bail” shall carry him away, it will be as a prey to “the coward conquest of a wretch’s knife.”

All this fits in significantly with Bacon’s connection with the unfortunate Essex business, 1600-1. The law (“public means which public manners breed”) was distasteful to him, but circumstances urged the necessity of such a career. After the Essex trial, he was subjected to a “vulgar scandal,” and was in fear

of assassination.* He returns penitently to his Muse, vowing "mine appetite I never more will grind," to his old "love" whom he describes as "next my heaven the best":—

"O benefit of ill! now I find true
That better is by evil still made better;
And ruin'd love, when it is built anew
Grows fairer than at first, more strong, far greater.
So I return rebuk'd to my content,
And gain by ill thrice more than I have spent."

Just as he rails on Lady Fortune in *Sonnet* III, he upbraids the dark lady for separating him and his "love":—

"Beshrew that heart that makes my heart to groan
For that deep wound it gives my friend and me;
Is't not enough to torture me alone,
But slave to slavery my sweet'st friend must be?
Me from myself thy cruel eye hath taken,
And my next self thou harder hast engross'd;
Of him, myself and thee, I am forsaken.—*Sonnet* 133.

This mistress (the "woman colour'd ill") is, in my opinion, the *personification of Fortune*. Her complexion is painted. She has usurped "the lineaments of Nature":—

"For since each hand hath put on Nature's power,
Fairing the foul with art's false borrow'd face."

Her "painting and usurping hair" denote her power by artifice to "ravish doters with a false aspect" (*Love's Labour's Lost*, IV., 3).

In his eyes she is an abhorrence. He has been betrayed by her, yet, in his heart, he dotes on her:—

* After the Essex affair, Bacon writes to Cecil, "I knew no remedy against libels and lies; . . . as for any violence to be offered to me, wherewith my friends tell me to no small terror that I am threatened, I thank God I have the privy coat of good conscience."

Also to Howard, "For my part, I have deserved better than to have my name objected to envy, or my life to a ruffian's violence."

And to the Queen, "My life has been threatened, and my name libelled."

"In faith, I do not love thee with mine eyes,
For they in thee a thousand errors note ;
But 'tis my heart that loves what they despise,
Who, in despite of view, is pleas'd to dote."—*Sonnet 141*.

"For thou betraying me, I do betray,
My nobler part to my gross body's treason.—*Sonnet 151*.

He can write of her :—

"Thou art as tyrannous, so as thou art
As those whose beauties proudly make them cruel :
For well thou know'st to my dear dotting heart
Thou art the fairest and most precious jewel."

and yet she is not really beautiful :—

"My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun ;
Coral is far more red than her lips' red ;
If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun ;
If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head,
I have seen roses damask'd red and white,
But no such roses see I in her cheeks."

These descriptions are widely inconsistent, and it is impossible for me to believe that any "mistress" other than some shape of the poetic imagination was intended.* His infatuation seems as fickle as Fortune herself !

According to Shakespeare :—

I. Fortune is *unkind* :—

"For herein Fortune shows herself more kind than is her custom."—*Merchant of Venice*, IV., 1.

* In "Shelton's" *Don Quixote* (Part II., Ch. I.), there is, in this connection, some interesting information. Don Quixote says to Sancho —

"For it is an ordinary thing amongst *poets*, once disdained or not admitted by their *feigned* mistresses (feigned indeed because they feign they love them) to revenge themselves with satires and libels,—a revenge truly unworthy noble spirits."

In Part I., Bk. III., Ch. XI., he writes,—“For all the poets who celebrate certain ladies at pleasure, thinkest thou they all had mistresses ? No.” He then goes on to deny that the “Amaryllises, the Phyllises, Silvias, Dianas,” &c., “were truly ladies of flesh and bones.”

“ The Dark Lady.”

2. She is *fickle* :—

“ O, Fortune, Fortune ! all men call thee fickle.”
Romeo and Juliet, III., 5.

3. She is a *strumpet* :—

“ O, most true ; she (Fortune) is a strumpet.”
Hamlet II., 2.

The black mistress answers these qualifications :—

1. “ O, call not me to justify the wrong,
 That thy *unkindness* lays upon my heart.”—*Sonnet* 139.

2. “ Those lips of thine,
 That have profaned their scarlet ornaments,
 And seal'd false bonds of love as oft as mine.”
 —*Sonnet* 148.

3. “ If eyes, corrupt by over-partial looks,
 Be anchored in the bay where all men ride,
 Why of eyes' falsehood hast thou forged hooks,
 Whereto the judgment of my heart is ty'd ?
 Why should my heart think that a several plot (*i.e.*
 enclosed field)
 Which my heart knows the wide world's common-place?”
 —*Sonnet* 137.

In *Troilus and Cressida* (III. 3), Shakespeare observes, “ some men creep in skittish Fortune's hall, while others play the idiot in her eyes.” Shakespeare is one of those who creep :—

“ Be it lawful I love thee, as thou lov'st those
 Whom thine eyes woo as mine importune thee :
 Root pity in thy heart that when it grows,
 Thy pity may deserve to pitied be.”—*Sonnet* 148.

In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare says they are blessed “ whose blood and judgment are so well commingled, they are not a pipe for Fortune's finger to sound what stop she please.” In *Sonnet* 128, he pictures his mistress playing, not the pipe—for that would destroy the illusion—but the virginal :—

“ Upon that blessed wood whose motion sounds
 With thy sweet fingers.”

He has pursued her feverishly, only to find himself “ her neglected child.” Now the word “ child ” is

very significant, for we often speak of a "child of Fortune," and would not be an appropriate term if the poet is referring to a living being. He can gain no "fair acceptance" in her will, but, so irresistible is she, that he cannot turn back :—

" But my five wits, nor my five senses can,
Dissuade one foolish heart from serving thee,
Who leaves unsway'd the likeness of a man,
Thy proud heart's slave, and vassal wretch to be ;
Only my plague thus far I count my gain,
That she that makes me sin awards me pain."

—Sonnet 141.

In other words, he has met with " Fortune's buffets," and not with any of her " rewards."

The mistress of whom he has found himself " mad in pursuit " is pictured in the poet's eye as black, because it is a colour of evil and symbolical of the *hell* which he feels within him :—

" For I have sworn thee fair, and thought thee bright
Who art as black as *hell*, as dark as night.—Sonnet 147.

" None knows well,
To shun the heaven that leads me to this *hell*."—

—Sonnet 129.

" To win me soon to *hell*, my female evil
Tempteth my better angel from my side,
And would corrupt my saint to be a devil."—Sonnet 144.

" The desire of power in excess," observes Bacon, in the *Essay of Goodness*, " caused the angels to fall." He believed he was born for the service of his countrymen, and, to that end, had " taken all knowledge to be his province." The sin of worldly ambition had tempted his " angel " (the holiest and best of all things—knowledge and philosophy—the pursuit of divine philosophy, to which he considered himself dedicated), and would procure the " fall " of his high ideals and divine contemplations. A genius is a man who makes the following of his star

the one immensely important thing in his life, and sees other mundane things—riches, honour, fame, &c., in their true proportions as of little value. Such is the view expressed in Dr. Turck's remarkable book, "The Man of Genius," which, since it was first published in 1896 in Germany, has been through seven editions. Dr. Turck discusses the character of Hamlet as a man of genius. Why does Hamlet delay to "sweep to his revenge"? Why does he seem to hesitate, waver? Simply because he is a genius, because he possesses an objective disinterested eye for things detached from mere circumstance. Dr. Turck observes:—

"It is not sorrow for the loss of his father that puts him beside himself, but rather his deep grief at the destruction of his fair ideal of the world, that paralyses his energy. Too greatly moved by his longings for the highest form of existence, he is unable to attach his soul to what is petty and personal. Yet he still believes himself bound by personal considerations, while his innermost soul struggles to soar far above it."

Hamlet was published in 1603. The *Sonnets* were written about that date. The tragedy of *Hamlet*, and of the author of the *Sonnets*, was playing a part for which Nature had not fitted him. The coincidence is a striking one, and points to Shakespeare having delineated his own passions in the character of Hamlet.

To return to "the dark lady." Fortune did not smile on Shakespeare for the abandonment of his "love" of comfort, for this one of "despair." The "expense of spirit" in her favour was wasted. No wonder, having "sold cheap what is most dear" to "ambition of the meaner sort," and meeting only with Fortune's "slings and arrows," the temptress appeared so hateful in his eyes!

According to Shakespeare, Fortune has no love; it is her custom to be *unkind*. Other characteristics are *blindness* and *inconstancy*:—

"That goddess blind."—*Henry V.*, III., 6.

"She is painted also with a wheel, to signify to you, which is the moral of it, that she is turning and inconstant."
—*Ibid.*

These attributes are found in the dark mistress :—

"I am perjur'd most
For all my vows are oaths but to misuse thee,
And all my honest faith in thee is lost ;
For I have sworn deep oaths of thy deep *kindness*,
Oaths of thy *love*, thy *truth*, thy *constancy* :
And, to enlighten thee, gave eyes to blindness,
Or made them swear against the thing they see ;
For I have sworn thee fair, more perjur'd I,
To swear, against the truth, so foul a lie !

—*Sonnet 152.*

The following aphorisms of Francis Bacon will be found to be reflected in the "dark lady" sonnets :—

"Inconstancy of Fortune with inconstancy of mind, makes a dark scene."

"He who hastens to be rich, shall not be innocent."

"Riches are the baggage of virtue ; they cannot be spared nor left behind, but they hinder the march."

"Great riches have sold more men than ever they have bought out."

"Men seem neither to understand their riches, nor their strength ; of the former they believe greater things than they should, and of the latter much less. And from hence fatal pillars have bounded the progress of learning."

"Fortune is not content to do a man one ill turn."

"Fortune has somewhat of the nature of a woman, who, if she be too much wooed, is commonly the farther off."*

* Precisely the theme of Sonnet 143, where Shakespeare compares the Dark Lady with a "housewife" (in *As You Like It*, he refers to the "housewife Fortune") running to catch one of her feathered creatures which has broken away, "whilst her neglected child holds her in chace." Shakespeare imagines himself as that tearful infant who

Cries to catch her whose busy care is bent
To follow that which flies before her face,
Not prizing her poor infant's discontent ;
So run'st thou after that which flies from thee,
Whilst I, thy babe, chace thee afar behind.

"The Dark Lady."

Shakespeare asks :—

“ Who would not wish to be from wealth exempt,
Since riches point to misery and contempt ? ”

Timon of Athens IV., 2.

The "good set terms" in which Shakespeare "railed on Lady Fortune," do not point to his having been one of her favoured minions :—

"Mudied in Fortune's mood." —*All's Well*, V., 2.

"The malevolence of Fortune."—*Macbeth* III., 6.

"So weary with disasters tugged with Fortune."

Macbeth III., i,

"A most poor man made tame to Fortune's blows."

Leav IV. 6.

"The fineness of which metal (constancy) is not found in Fortune's love."—*Troilus and Cressida* I., 3.

"Fortune that arrant whore."—*Lear* II., 4.

"False Fortune."—*Lear* V., 3.

"Giddy Fortune."—*Henry V.* III., 6.

"Harsh Fortune."—*Antony and Cleopatra* II., 6

"Crooked Fortune."—*Two Gentlemen*, IV. 1.

(In *Sonnet 121*, the dark mistress is called a "gentle cheater.")

The Sonnets inform us that Shakespeare sought, in his writings, no personal gain or glory. His mind was fixed upon posterity, and the immortality of the "heirs of his invention." Could there be a more splendid and lasting monument?

In the Proem to the "Great Instauration," Bacon writes:—

"For myself, my heart is not set upon any of those things which depend upon external accidents. I am not hunting for fame . . . and to look for any private gain from such an undertaking as this, I count both ridiculous and base. Enough for me, the consciousness of well deserving, and those real and effectual results with which Fortune herself cannot interfere."

R. L. EAGLE.

THE RIVAL POET.

BACONIANS are agreed, I think, that in the Sonnets, "Shakespeare" when not addressing his own Muse—the master-mistress, Apollo or the spirit of poesy—is soliloquizing, until, in Sonnet 127, we come to the famous "Dark Lady," whom I claim to have successfully shown, is the personification of Fortune. But there is still the difficulty of the "Rival Poet" (Sonnets 79-86) which, whether it has any bearing on the identity of "Shakespeare" or not, is an ever elusive and interesting subject. In Sonnet 78, Shakespeare tells us that whatever he writes he is indebted to the assistance or inspiration of his "love":—

Yet be most proud of that which I compile,
Whose influence is thine, and born of thee.

In Sonnet 79, we learn that he has enjoyed the monopoly of this aid, but now his place is usurped by another:—

Whilst I *alone* did call upon thy aid,
My verse alone had all thy gentle grace;
But *now* my gracious numbers are decay'd,
And my sick muse doth give *another* place.

This "better spirit" (Sonnet 80) has been generally supposed to mean Spenser, but it is clear that the Rival has only just appeared, whereas Spenser, at the time the Sonnets were written (1599-1603), was no more.

There can be no doubt about the "better spirit" being a poet, and a sonneteer praising the same Muse:

There lives more life in one of your fair eyes
Than both your poets can in praise devise.

And does not Shakespeare refer to "the proud full sail of his great verse?" Who could this have been whose "spirit" was "by spirits taught to write above a mortal pitch,"—"compeers by night, giving him aid?"

There is a poet who answers this description, and whom I suggest is the Rival—Michael Drayton.

In his "IDEA" Sonnets he, like Shakespeare, addresses the poetic Muse in remarkably similar terms and with all the Shakespearean confidence in immortality. There were four distinct editions of Drayton's "IDEA" Sonnets—1594 (eighteen Sonnets), 1599 (twenty-one were added), in 1602 eight more appeared, and in 1605 seven more were added. In 1619 were printed, for the first time, the remaining ten.

In the 1599 and all later editions Drayton prefixed the following lines, "To the Reader of these Sonnets," which might have been applied equally well to the Shakespeare Sonnets. It is passing strange that the "men of letters" have not accepted the clue to the interpretation of the Shakespeare Sonnets supplied by these lines:—

Into these Loves, who but for Passion looks
At this first sight, here let him lay them by!
And seek elsewhere in turning other books,
Which better may his labour satisfy.
No far-fetched sigh shall ever wound my breast!
Love from mine eye, a Tear shall never wring!
No "Ah me!"s my whining sonnets drest!
A Libertine! *fantastically I sing!*
My Verse is the true image of my Mind,
Ever in motion, still desiring change:
And, as thus, to variety inclined;
So in all humours sportively I range!
My muse is rightly of the English strain,
That cannot long one fashion entertain.

The main theme of the Shakespeare and the Drayton Sonnets is identical, and the terms employed by the respective authors, in working out this theme, are so similar that there would appear to have been some mysterious connection between the writings. In Sonnet 44 (1599) Drayton addresses his Muse:—

Whilst thus my pen strives to eternize thee,
 Age rules my lines with wrinkles in my face,
 Where, in the map of all my misery;
 Is modelled out the world of my disgrace;
 Whilst in despite of tyrannizing times,
 Medea-like, I make thee young again,
 Proudly thou scorn'st my world-out-wearing rhymes,
 And murderest virtue with thy coy disdain :
 And though in youth my youth untimely perish,
 To keep thee from oblivion and the grave
 Ensuing ages yet my rhymes shall cherish,
 Where I entombed my better part shall save;
 And though this earthly body fade and die,
 My name shall mount upon eternity.

Compare the first line of this Sonnet with Shakespeare's Sonnet 81 :—

You still shall live (such virtue hath my pen).

Line 2 with Sonnet 63 :—

Against my love shall be as I am now,
 With time's injurious hand crush'd and o'er-worn,
 When hours have drain'd his blood and fil'd his brow
 With lines and wrinkles.

The " tyrannizing times " are reflected in Shakespeare's Sonnet 66, and the last six lines again and again, notably in 18 :—

But thy eternal summer shall not fade,
 Nor lose possession of that fair thow ow'st,
 Nor shall death brag thou wandr'st in his shade,
 When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st,
 So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,
 So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

Drayton's reference to his Muse as " my better part," reminds us of Shakespeare's Sonnet 39 :—

Oh, how thy worth with manners may I sing,
 When thou art all the *better part* of me ?

Evidently our poets followed Horace :—

A monument I've reared more durable than brass, and loftier than the princely structure of the pyramids, which neither biting rain can overthrow, nor fierce north wind nor lapse of countless years and flight of time.

I shall not wholly die, and all my better part shall Libitina shun :

I shall increase in after-fame with glory ever fresh, etc.

Ode XXX., " The Poet's Immortal Love."

Shakespeare's Sonnet 55 is, of course, based directly upon Horace's ode. There is no need to dwell upon other instances of the curious harmony between these poets.

If, as I think can be shown, Shakespeare complimented Drayton on "the proud full sail of his great verse, bound for the prize of all too precious you," it is a happy allusion to this vigorous but graceful poet.

But how does Drayton qualify in respect to the aid of spirits by night? In "The Barons' Wars," Canto IV., Verse 39, Drayton, about to tell of "new sorts of plagues . . . strange apparitions and prodigious birth, unheard-of sickness and calamities," writes :—

Now lighter humour leave me and be gone,
Your passion poor yields matter much too slight
To write those plagues, that then were coming on,
Doth ask a pen of ebon, and the night
If there be ghosts their murder that bemoan,
Let them approach me and in piteous plight
Howl, and about me with black tapers stand
To lend a sad light to my sadder hand.

In the First Canto, Verse 4, Drayton appeals for supernatural aid in his mighty attempt :—

O Thou, the wise director of my muse,
Upon whose bounty all my powers depend,
Into my breast thy sacredst fire infuse;
Ravish my spirit this great work to attend
Let the still *night* my laboured lines peruse
That when my poems gain their wished end,
Such whose sad eyes shall read this tragic story,
In my weak hand may see thy might and glory.

Was this stanza in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote of "that affable familiar Ghost that nightly gulls him with intelligence"? Drayton seems the only likely candidate for the honours of the "Rival Poet."

R. EAGLE.

JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

ON finding a mention by Fuller that a certain Dr. King had shown the bad taste and want of feeling, while attending the funeral obsequies of Sir Thomas Meautys, to "make sport" with the skull of the celebrated Lord Bacon, which in some way had become exposed, it became our duty to endeavour to trace who this personage was.

The authority quoted above tells us that in 1649 the vault of the Bacons, in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, was opened to receive the coffin of the man who had acted as Secretary so long to his kinsman, the author of *De Augmentis*. It was then seen that the skull of Lord Bacon lay separate from the body, and Dr. King picking it up, did make sport of it ; "but," adds Fuller, "the man who made ridicule of it then, is since become the laughing stock of others."

In a former "Jottings" on this subject, we were inclined to speculate what speech Dr. King made on this occasion, and whether it was possible that he quoted the lines from *Hamlet*, where the Prince of Denmark says :—

Why may not that be the scull of a lawyer. Where be his quiddets now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks ? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel and will not tell him of his action of battery.

And if Dr. King did so with the knowledge that the author's head was in his hands at the moment ?

The Doctor King thus described, certainly called down ridicule and trouble upon himself in several ways, and he seems to have been a fussy, self-important man, who desired at all costs to be in the public eye.

His capabilities and intellect were of no mean order, and should have led him to great things, if an in-

ordinate vanity or self-esteem had not spoilt an otherwise strong intellect.

He was a Justice of the Peace in St. Albans, and in that remarkable old register, called "*Accounts of the St. Alban Grammar School between the years 1646 and 1659,*" we find he was one of its Governors, being described as "*John King, Doctor in Phissick.*"

He also undertook to be pay-master of the fees and tradesmen's bills in connection with this Free School, and his sons were educated there, the eldest entering as a scholar in 1644, and two more later on.

This eldest son, whose name also was "John," became more distinguished than his father ever was, for after receiving all the learning the St. Albans Free School could give him, he took a scholarship at Eton, and went on to Queen's College, Cambridge.

His taste led him to the Bar, and he eventually became King's Counsel and Attorney General to the Duke of York, and was knighted in 1674.

Referring back to Dr. John King, we find his name appears pretty often in the MS. Accounts of the Grammar School. This establishment was first started during Sir Nicholas Bacon's time, and he and his successors at Gorhambury helped to support it with donations of money, besides books, of which it received a considerable store.* Several of its scholars afterwards occupied the position of Mayor to the town, and sat in Parliament. Some of the following items, culled from the accounts, may prove of interest to the readers of BACONIANA.

The stipend of the three Head Masters (in 1647), Mr. Greene, Mr. Steedham and Mr. Ditchfield, was respectively £24 13s. 4d. per annum, while the Usher received £6 10s.

*Some of these books still exist there.

The scholars had to contribute £1 15s. for coals to keep themselves warm, and the school was furnished with an "hour glass," for which 8d. was paid. Candlesticks for the school cost £2 13s., and six extinguishers 9d.

The name of Gilbert Siliock, a vintner, occurs pretty often, as he occupied the important position of a Governor of the School, as well as being Landlord of the "Corner Tavern," and one item runs, "Item 1648, 1649. Recd. of Mr. Gilt. Selioke for one whole yeares rent for the Town wyne Lycence £11 oos. ood.

"Item: Pd. by me John King, Doctor in Phissick, the 10th June, 1647, to Edward Clark, by vertue of an order from the Maior and Burgesses, dated 7th June, 1647, being the Lady Day rent of Mr. Gilbert Sillock, the sum of £5.

"Item: At the Maior's Court ye 20th Dec., 1647. It is ordered by the Maior and Burgesses of this Burrough that Doctor John King, is desired to pay William Hickman of the said Burrough the sum of £5, out of the monies in his hands that he hath received of Mr. Gilt. Silcock for his wyne licence as he was one of the Governors of the Free School, for the satisfyinge of the remainder of the 15 lb. which he payed for the use of the sd. Burrough according to our desire £5."

"Item: Pd. Doctor King's man ffor a warrant ffor ffeching the Seasors before him for Seassing the Schooleland £100 oos. o6d."

"Item: The 18th of Janry, 1647. Rec.: the day and year abovsaid by me William Hickman, of Doctor John King, ye sum of £5 according to the order of the Maior and Burgesses, being a full discharge of the ffeeteene pounds, which I have payd by their appointment for the use of the Burrough.

I say rec.

(Signed) WILL HICKMAN."

We are glad to see that the labours of the school were lightened by play-acting at their "breaking up."

"Item: Pd. the Musicke for playeing the sevrall scenes, when the boyes acted the two Commodies of "*Lingua*" and "*The Jealous Lovers*," at two of their breaking up. £00 10s. 00d.

"Item: Given to the boyes that acted, £00 05s. 00d., 15th of Decr., 1662."

On looking up references we find "*Lingua*" was written before 1602, by Thos. Tomkin, of Trinity Coll., Cambridge, and that it was acted before Queen Elizabeth, and first printed in 1607.

"*The Jealous Lovers*" is one of Thos. Randolp's best comedies. It was printed in quarto, 1632.

Some boyish pranks result in 2d. having to be spent in the following way:

Item: Payd to Mathias Clament for taking a stone out of the Locke of the School doore, £00 00s. 02d."

Besides Dr. John King's labours in helping the workings and management of the Free School in St. Albans, he must have occupied the position of chief physician in the town, and no doubt had attended Sir Thomas Meautys, of Gorhambury, in his last illness, which ended in death, 1649. In the capacity of family doctor, he attended the funeral, and thought himself intimate enough with the family to handle the skull of Viscount St. Alban, and to make a ridiculous speech over it.

Unfortunately, there is no means of knowing what he said on the occasion.

During this year of 1649, Dr. King had found himself in trouble and opposition to his neighbours in the town, and he invoked Parliament to his aid. He, as Justice of the Peace, had evidently given an adverse decision, which caused the mob to handle the lordly person of the physician with violence, after which they proceeded to wreck his dwelling. Whereupon the

doctor asserted his authority, and vowed vengeance against his enemies. But he got little satisfaction, as the town continued in opposition to him in every way possible.

The ringleader in this riot was a Ralphe Pollard, who had been a scholar in the Free School, and in the State Papers at the Record Office of London the following is to be found :

“ June 15, 1649.

“ Council of State to the Mayor and Justices of the Peace of St. Albans.

“ There was lately a riot in your town upon the house and person of Dr. King, Justice of the Peace, and while he was in execution of that office, which, if it should pass without due prosecution, would be a great scandal to the Government and an encouragement to disaffected persons to stir up distempers among the people.

“ Let the parties offending be had in examination and information taken against them on oath, and that they may be proceeded against next Quarter Session.”

This “ distemper ” among the townspeople was not easily quelled by either Dr. King or the Government.

“ Aug. 11, 1649. Whitehall Council of State to the Attorney General. Not long since a riot was committed by certain inhabitants of St. Albans at the home and against the person of Dr. King. Complaint being made to the Council, we wrote to the Sessions and an indictment was preferred against them, but the Jury would not find a bill, notwithstanding the full and express evidence for it.

“ An information is therefore to be put into the Upper Bench, and you are to receive instructions from Dr. King, and take care the business be proceeded in effectually.”

The result of this appeal to the “ Upper Bench,” resulted in a warrant.

" Warrant. To go to St. Albans and apprehend T. Dalton, W. Hensman, Ralpe Pollard, J. Cooper, Ed. Thomas, Thos. Reddey and A. Whelpley, for miscarriage against Dr. King." (Whatever punishment was meted out to the offenders had little effect on their future—Ralpe Pollard for one, living to be Mayor of his native city from 1637 to 1647.)

These proceedings did not tend to add to Dr. King's popularity, and it is said that he threw up his public appointments in disgust in that year, and retired to London, where we find him described as of Aldersgate Street.

It was probably his failure in this law case that caused Fuller to say that " now he is the laughed at by others."

A. C. BUNTEN.

CHIEF EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF SIR THOMAS
MEAUTYS, KNT., BROTHER OF LADY JANE
CORNWALLIS, AND 2ND COUSIN TO SIR THOS.
MEAUTYS, SECRETARY TO LORD BACON.

Thomas Meautys, the elder, must have been born about 1580 or a little later, at West Ham, Essex.

His father was Hercules Meautys, who married Phillippe, daughter of Richard Cooke, of Gidea Hall, Essex. This Miss Cooke was a granddaughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, Preceptor to King Edward VI.

Thomas Meautys entered the army as a young man, and was sent to his uncle, Thos. Wilson, in Ireland. He rose in rank, and obtained a Captaincy.

On August 18th, 1604, we find a letter from Captain Meautys to the Earl of Salisbury, whom he begs him not to credit the scandal laid on him by a shameless woman, who sues him for debt.

A little later, he must have quarrelled with Sir Francis (or Sir Horace Vere), August 16th, 1608. Sir Francis Vere to Lord Salisbury, from Tilbury begs him to nominate another person rather than Capt. Meautys for a certain post. The Captain having slandered him.

Before 1611, Captain Meautys lost a limb in fighting, and for his services he was knighted, *Knight Bachelor* ; by the King at Whitehall, February 8th, 1611.

In February, 1611, Sir Thos. Meautys writes to the Lord Secretary Salisbury, and says his estate is brought low by expenses of his lost limb, and he begs the King's aid to buy an Exchequer pension of 1,000 marks per an., which is to be sold for £2,500, to support the rank lately conferred on him.

Later on he was engaged in the wars of the Palatinate with a company of English Volunteers in the pay of the Prince of Orange.

On October 17th, 1614, he writes to his sister, Lady Cornwallis, at Broome, in Suffolk, saying he has been at Tulyers for 16 weeks, and that he wishes news of her by the messenger he is sending with letters for the Court.

Again on December 7th, 1614, he writes to his sister to wish her "content" in her second marriage to Sir Nathaniel Bacon, and says he is still at Tulyers, which is 250 miles from the seaside. He is still at Tulyers in October, 1615, and also in 1616.

He writes again to her from Arnheim, November 7th, 1622. He writes from London to his sister, December, 1624, saying he had not heard from his mother (Phillipa Cooke), but understand she has been very ill. An affectionate brotherly letter. His mother is at Coventry.

In January, 1625, he writes to tell his sister he is going down to Coventry to marry the eldest daughter of Sir Richard Burneley, and that her portion is £1,500. He praises her very much and adds that his sister, Lady Sussex, has promised them £200 a year, and he asks a helping hand from Lady Jane also. He writes again, March, 1625, and April, saying he is now returning to the *Low Countries*.

In September, 1625, he writes an important letter to his sister from Colchester, saying he is employed at these "Marrytanyan" ports, for to raise sutch workes as I shall thinke fyttest for the preservation of of the Haven of Colchester. I have with me 500 foote, and a troope of horse, besides 200 foote which I founde in the towne before my aryvall.

"But I am to hasten my retourne to the Army for that the enymye is drawne down with more forses to Donkerick, and that all their fleet is drawne out of their harbour. I do want the assistance of servants exceedingly, and my Lord Warrick was fayne to lend me his page to attend me this jorny.

" My poor wyfe hath not heard from me never since my coming from her, neither do I know how to send her."

In July 1627, he is in London and writes to console his sister on the death of her second husband, Sir Nathaniel Bacon; a beautiful religious letter. He begs her to help him with some money, as he must leave some with his wife when he goes back to the Low Countries with Lord Vere. Money is owing him there, about £400.

After arriving at the Hague he writes to his sister that he has presented the gift she entrusted him with, to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, who opened it before the Court and praised it.

In April, 1628, Sir Thomas and Lady Meautys invited their cousin, Thomas Meautys (who was Clerk of the Privy Council and had formerly been private Secretary to Lord Bacon) to come over to the Low Countries to be present at the christening of their child there, but the Clerk of the Privy Council fears he cannot give a direct answer to his cousins until he has settled some " term " business concerning " My Lord St. Alban's Creditors." He mentions this in a letter to Sir Thomas Meautys' sister, Lady Jane Cornwallis.

In November, 1629, Mr. Long wrote and told Lady Jane Cornwallis he had received both the sums of money she sent him for her brother, Sir Thos. Meautys, one of £20, and the other of £66.

The £66 was for the redeeming of silver plate, &c., which Lieutenant Smyth had pawned in Cheapside, and the £20 was to procure men for the furnishing of his Company.

The men, plate, etc., were all sent over by Smyth to him in the Low Countries.

We learn in the same letter that Lady Jane Corn-

wallis has taken the place of a mother to his eldest boy, Hercules, who is at present in Mr. and Mrs. Long's care, but who has been ill with "ague."

Mr. Long adds that he presented this child to his uncle, the late Earle of Sussex, before he died, and that the Earle put him down in his will for a legacy of £300.

The next letter mentions the death of the child's grandfather, Sir Richard Burnaby, and that Lady Burnaby would now take care of the child (but we see that Lady Jane continues to keep the child). In the next letter there is talk of the child being sent to his parents in the Low Countries, and Mrs. Long tells Lady Jane how she has spent the £5 Lady Jane sent her for the child's maintenance.

In a letter from Sir Thomas Meautys to his sister, Lady Jane Cornwallis, 2nd December, 1632, from Arnheim, he mentions the grief of the Queen of Bohemia for the death of the King who died at Mentz, in Germany. Sir Thomas has been "waiting on the Queen at her Court at Rene," and the Queen sends kind messages to Lady Jane, and praises her, especially when she heard that Lady Jane still had the son of Sir Thomas living with her,—Hercules. He seems very proud of his little daughter, Nan, and says: "*When I cannot see my children it does me good to talk of them.*"

Lady Meautys writes to Lady Jane Cornwallis at Broome, from London, April 16th, 1633, saying she is about to join her husband in the Low Countries, and can Lady Jane send her the money which is really not due till Midsummer, as Sir Alexander Radcliffe and his wife, who promised them a yearly income, cannot give them anything at present, though they hope to do so later on.

A second letter to the same saying that if the Radcliffes don't pay her the £200 a year promised, she and

her children would have no money if anything happened to Sir Thos. Meautys, and begs Lady Jane's assistance in this matter.

In the next letter we see Lady Jane sent Lady Meauty's some money. The latter is sailing to join her husband in the Low Countries.

In a letter to Lady Jane from *Delft*, June, 1635, Lady Meautys says she is in attendance on the Queen of Bohemia, "who uses her with a great deal of favour." and has given her some of her own linen to make clothes, which is a consolation to her husband and herself in their many troubles.

Their children are still in England.

Lady Jane sent them £100 to Hague, and she still had their son with her in 1641, and in 1642.

January 5th, 1644, from the Hague, in a letter from Lady Meautys to her sister-in-law, Lady Jane Cornwallis, she thanks her for some money, without which she and her children would have had nothing to subsist upon, as they were starving. That Sir Thos. is still at Arnheim, and is "so miserably treated there by injustice that he has no money and through his heavy troubles he is growne very sickelie that those near him was doubtful of his recoveries, and that she intends leaving her children at the Hague and going to see him."

This is the last letter, and it is supposed that he then died.

His widow was living in 1659, and is named as a Legatee under the will of Lady Jane Cornwallis (Lady Bacon).

A. C. BUNTEN.

THE SPEAR AND ITS LORE.

THE Spear that carries death to the enemy, and victory to the Grasper and Brandisher, is the emblem of Odin, the strong exultant One, the Silent One of Northern Mythology.

"The Spear trembled and the battle began." [Saga.]

Erik, Commander of hosts, threw Odin's Spear, and said "Odin owns you all."

When the Jarl (the high-born chief and warrior) grew up, he *shook the Spear* and threw the Javelin. The Sons of Jarl shook ash-Spears, and at *the Thing* the great Council or Meeting, resolutions were made by weapons taken up and *shaken*.

To the North-Man the Spear, and the Sword, was each a Light-bearer. Odin had swords carried into the great Hall, because they shone like fire, no other light was used while he and his warriors sat drinking. Odin's Spear was called *Gun-gnir*, his sword *Maekir*.

From the Spears of the *Valkyrja*, the nine Goddesses of Victory, too, sprang rays of light.

Our eclectic Francis, the Light-bearer, drew water from the Wisdom Well of the Ancients of all nations. Was he indebted in part to Scandinavia for his pseudonym of Shake-Spear? Hitherto we have believed it was to Pallas he went for that particular inspiration.

Edwin Reed, in his Shake-Spear *Pseudonym* reminds us that Pallas Athenæ and her Spear stood for the strength that is always inherent in the cause of Truth, and that her name, Pallas, was derived from "to shake," adding the fact that she was armed with a Spear which rose 70 feet in length in her statue by Phidias on the Acropolis, and that in Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon her name is given etymologically as

"THE BRANDISHER OF THE SPEAR,"

He says Pallas Athenæ represents not only Art in

general, but precisely that branch of Art to which the Plays of Shake-Spear belong, seeing that Richard de Bury, High Chancellor of England in the fifteenth century, and one of the most learned men of that age, said : " The Wisdom of the Ancients devised a way of inducing men to study Truth by means of pious frauds, the delicate Minerva, secretly lurking beneath the Masque of Pleasure." This is pointed out as the reason of the hyphen between the two symbols Shake and Spear, as printed in many of the original quartos, and also in the folio of 1623.

With the Light-bearing symbolism of the Spear in our minds, it is interesting to find that Francis says, " I have held out a light to posterity by a *Torch* set up in the obscurity of philosophy," also " Matters should not hang upon any one man's *sparkling and shaking Torch*."

The Scandinavian Nornir, or Fates, were the embodiment and philosophy of Life, who watered with whey water the Ash Yggdrasil. They dwelt by Urd's Well, whose roots they watered with their wisdom and experience of the past. The water which fell thence was called *Honey-Dew*, and the *bees fed* on it. Two swans lived in Urd's Well, from whom sprang the kin of birds.

" Three Destinies (or Fates) in long robes of white Taffeta, like aged women, with Garlands of Narcissus, and in their left hands distaffs, and in their right hands carrying altogether a Tree of Golde," were brought upon the stage in a Masque, presented in the Banqueting Room at Whitehall on St. Stephen's night at the marriage of the Earl of Somerset and the Lady Frances Howard. This Masque is supposed to have been written by Thomas Campion, the letters of whose surname make the sentence, " I am Pacon," " but these things are but toys to come amongst such serious

observations" [Francis Bacon, *Of Masques and Triumphs*.] "To conclude the knowledge of the early ages was either great or happy; great if they by design made . . . use of trope and figure; happy if . . . they afforded matter and occasion to such noble contemplations." [*Wisdom of the Ancients*].

A. A. L.

OPHELIA AND LIEGE.

THE town of Liège is in every one's thoughts just now, and it is interesting to find it connected in the past with Francis Bacon.

It was the scene of an episode singularly akin in fact, romance and pathos to one enshrined by Shakespeare in *Hamlet*, Act 5, s. 1, one which Francis Bacon may very well have been an eye-witness of.

Colonel Haggard, in his "Amours of Henry de Navarre and Margaret de Valois" (p. 173), tells how a Maid of Honour to Queen Margot died a victim of a broken heart in the old Flemish city of *Luik* or *Liège*. Marquis de Varambon, riding at ease down the narrow street of that most picturesque of towns, was forced to stop as the mourners and the bier went on, learning, as he did so, that "she who was a woman," and "of some estate," was indeed a Lady-in-waiting to the young queen.

Stricken to the heart, the noble lover fell from his horse in a swoon. The untimely death of the young Court Lady brought about by "Love, the most ancient of all the gods," the dramatic incident attending her burial, its picturesque background, (the river Maass, the beautiful Palace of Justice, the residence of the Prince Bishop, of whom we shall speak again) the still figure, stretched upon the bier with

its pathetic accompaniments of "virgin Kranz, maiden strewments," the sudden shock sustained by the noble youth whose heart was still hers, were all priceless experiences for him who looked upon Nature as God's Art, and reflected, as I think, this scene in the pellucid mirror of his artist soul with the best results.

That I believe Francis Bacon visited Liège in 1577-81 I have already stated in "Bacon and Portugal," (BACONIANA, January, 1914). We find that Edward Burnham in that year was sent to the battle-field of civil and political liberty, Holland, by Elizabeth and Walsingham, also that he passed through *Luicke* or *Licques* on his way, and conferred with Monsieur de Licques, who was, in all probability, the Bishop just referred to.

I will not repeat my reasons for believing Edward Burnham to have been Elizabeth's young Lord Keeper of State-Secrets, Francis, but merely register again the fact that I *do* think so, and that I also like to think the yet unwritten play of *Hamlet* was the richer for his embassy to Liège.

Margaret de Valois relates the untimely death of Mlle. de Tournon, *a relation of her own*, in her *Memoires*. She gives full details, including the white pall, and the *chaplets of flowers* that strewed the body.

A. A. LEITH.

FINDS IN THE FOLIO.

PRINTS of the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare Plays are rarely available.

But facsimile reproductions may be obtained and should be studied. It is probable that every one of the plays is there earmarked with either Bacon's signature or other subtle indication of his authorship.

Where the clowns come on the scene there is often something ready for interpretation. Students should look out for passages where the author leaves the play and talks right out to them.

"KING JOHN."

The instance in *King John*, p. 2, is well known :—

"My deare Sir. Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin."

"HAMLET."

There is another in *Hamlet*, p. 259.

"Your bait of falshood takes this cape of truth ;
And thus doe we of wisdom and of reach
With windlasses and with assayes of Bias,
By indirections finde directions out.
So by my former lecture and advice
Shall you, my sonne."

"Cape" means "cover." "Sonne," the intelligent reader and not Reynaldo.

Investigators should look out for the carefully screened communication, the indirect direction, and will find that the author is giving them much help.

"MUCH ADO."

How in *Much Ado*, page 111 (the K cipher count of the word "Bacon") the process by which the name George Seacole is changed into the name of the play's author, Francis Bacon, has already been explained in BACONIANA.

" TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA."

Two Gentlemen of Verona shows a similar communication. Launce (which is a clown part) is the servant of Sir Protheus—a conjunction of significant names. At page 27, Launce says :—" Why stand—under and understand is all one." Just a line or so above, the word " staffe " stands under the word " Launce." A lance with a staff under it is a " speare." In reply to a question whether something will " *be a match*," Launce refers to his dog. " If hee shake his taile and say nothing it will." The context implies shake his head. In this way we get as head " shake " which added to " speare " gives " Shakespeare." Speed then remarks, " The conclusion is then that it will." Match B A to C O N, which is the conclusion gives Bacon. Launce comments, " Thou shalt never get such a secret from me but by a parable."

" RICHARD II."

At the bottom of page 33 (the ordinary figure equivalent of the name Bacon) in *Richard II.*, the commencing capitals (omitting those beginning with T) give Fras. The first lines of the scene are :—

" My Lord of Salisbury we have stay'd ten days
And hardly kept our *countrymen* together."

This we interpret as a direction to *count* ten.

Count ten lines from the bottom of the page, and we come to :—

" The *bay-trees* in our *countrey* all are wither'd."

This gives Baycoun, Ergo Fras. Bacon, the true author's signature disclosed by the inductive method of reasoning.

" LOVE'S LABOUR LOST."

On page 129 of *Love's Labour Lost*, there is a line given once more to a Clown.

" O marrie me to one Francis."

The seven letters in Francis carry us to page 136. On this page, counting from the bottom of the first column the 33rd line is :—" What is A B spelt backward with the horn on his head." This gives B A Cornu, Latin for horn. In this way the clown (Shakespeare) is associated with Francis Bacon.

" KING LEAR."

A strongly proved Bacon signature is upon page 287 of *King Lear*. At the foot of the second column, reading from the bottom upwards the following words and syllable occur at the terminals of lines :—

is
bee
Con
France
Sir.

From these can be obtained the signature Sir Francis Bacon.

There is proof of the intentional placing of these terminals.

1. In the Quarto of this play the above words and syllable occur, but not in the terminals of lines.

2. In the Folio they appear except the turnover word " Sir " in the only lines which both (1) commence with a word in italics, and (2) continue right out to the margin of the column.

3. Counting the letters of each line, including the italic word, there are 33 letters up to " is," 33 letters up to " bee," 33 letters up to " Con," and 33 letters up to " France." This indicates a careful setting of the type of the Folio page.

4. The word " Servant " in the quarto is changed to " Knight " in the Folio and in the folio line ending with " bee " the word Knight is shortened to " Knigh,"

or the count of 33 letters would not have been maintained.

5. The word "Sir" is the turnover word, but it also occurs just above in the line:—

"Knigh Sir, he answered me in the roundest manner he."

A count beginning after this word Sir gives 33 letters.

6. In the same column after the stage direction, "Enter Steward," the first five lines give a running signature of Shakespeare, taking the first "S," the next "h," the next "a," to the "h," and so on.

King Lear calls the Steward a Fellow, and also a Clotpole.

On the following page 288 the king calls the Steward "whorson dog," "slave," "curre," "rascall." Kent calls him a base football plaier. Eliminate "football," and the base plaier is the Steward of the king's daughters (the plays?)

Students of the Folio will find it a rich mine of interesting covered communications. As a practice they might well begin at page 41, *Merry Wives*, bottom of its second column, and see how the author tells us he has translated Homer's *Iliad*.

PARKER WOODWARD.

W. E. CLIFTON.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR EDITOR,—“How little information do we gather as to the personality of Breton, Lodge, or Barnfield from their snatches of song scattered through the miscellanies.”

[P. 171, Robert Herrick, by Moorman.]

This pithy little paragraph gives food for thought, let us chew upon it, as Francis Bacon would say. Certainly a close study of these poets' works makes for Francis Bacon being their sole begetter.

A STUDENT IN BACONISM.

London, 1914.

“Experiment Solitary Touching Flying in the Air.”

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

[*Nat. History*, 886, Vol. I., Bacon's Works].

“It is reported, that amongst the Leucadians, in ancient time, upon a superstition they did use to precipitate a man from a high cliff into the sea; tying him about with strings, at some distance, many great fowls; and fixing unto his body divers feathers, spread, to break the fall. Certainly many birds of good wing, as kites and the like, would bear up a good weight, as they fly; and spreading of feathers thin and close, and in great breadth, will likewise bear up a great weight, being even laid, without tilting upon the sides. The farther extension of this experiment for flying may be thought upon.”

[The above comes with particular force to our notice when our flyers in the air have so distinguished themselves.]

Yours truly,

A BACONIAN.

Bacon's Death.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Mrs. Bunten has satisfied me that the Thomas Meautys, who wrote the undated letter (said to have been written about April, 1626), containing the postscript “My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried” was his lordship's former Secretary, but at that date Clerk to the Privy Council.

Further, that he was not knighted until some time afterwards and that he was the person who married Anne, surviving child of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, a grandson of Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon.

My surmise about the possibility that the other Sir Thomas Meautys accompanied his lordship of St. Albans in an escape abroad, must be abandoned.

But the above remarkably unemotional postscript rather emphasizes my belief that we cannot accept this statement by the former Secretary and always devoted friend, as final.

There are too many curious incidents to permit of this, and, about which, light may be forthcoming any day.

PARKER WOODWARD.

In Regard to Bacon's Delicate Health.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

The writer of the letter on pages 122-3 of the April *BACONIANA*, who signs his missive "A Lover of Facts," was very far astray in one of his facts, when he got the two Thomas Meauty's so badly mixed as shown on pages 111 and 121. He states in this letter "but what we know of his (Bacon's) delicate health precludes that conclusion," that is the conclusion that he lived to 1668. His attention might be called to letter written in 1668 by Bacon's friend and secretary, Sir Thomas Bushell (16 -1672) who laments the death of his old friend and teacher, Viscount St. Albans. Bushell is careful not to indicate the precise time of his Patron's death, but judging from other data it is very easy to guess that it was of a recent date. It is a well-known fact, that frequently just the people of "delicate health" are those who live the longest. A great uncle of the writer lived to the age of 93 years; all his life he was a man of "delicate health," but he took good care of himself and lived to be many years older than his more vigorous brothers and sisters. An uncle of the writer is still living at the age of 98 and one-half years, the oldest living graduate of Yale University (of New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.), he has always been a man of "delicate health." It is a well-known fact that Viscount Saint Alban had a medical man, Peter Boenor, in his employ for many years to attend to his health, the result was that Bacon learned how to preserve his life beyond the lives of his contemporaries.

In the 17th century a Moses Wheeler, born in 1598, in Kent County, England, died January 15th, 1698, in Stratford, Connecticut Colony of New England, aged 100 years. A John Moss, born in 1603, in England, died in 1707, at New Haven, Connecticut Colony, aged 104 years. A Thomas Finch, baptized in 1612, at Bocking, England, died in 1704 at Norwalk, Connecticut Colony, aged 92. Undoubtedly similar cases of longevity can be recorded of people in England at that time. Therefore, judging from these well-authenticated cases, it is not at all improbable or impossible that Viscount Saint Alban lived to the age of 107 years. It might be noted here that the celebrated "Northumberland manuscripts were brought to light in 1867, about 200 years after 1668.

ANOTHER "LOVER OF FACTS."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—While noting down curious parallels between George Chapman in his "Iliads" and Bacon and Shake-speare, such as "dotard" used by Bacon, and "top-filled" as used in the present tense of the coined verb by Lady Macbeth, I found the following passage, a vastly pleasant one if read in the light of our splendid British soldiers of to-day and their fine morale:—

"Atrides yet coasts through the troops, confirming men so staid :

'O friends,' said he 'hold up your minds ; strength is but strength of will ;

Rev'rence each other's good in fight, and shame at things done ill.

Where soldiers show an honest shame, and love of honour lives,

That ranks men with the first in fight."

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

[Homer's "Iliads," Vth Book.]

FRANCIS BACON'S VIEW OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF TRAFALGAR, 21ST OCTOBER, 1914.

"This Island is become the Lady of the Sea."—*Resuscitatio*.

"The seas are our walls and the ships our bulwarks."—*Letter to Buckingham*.

"Surely at this day the advantage of strength at sea which is one of the principal dowries of this Kingdom of Great Britain are great."—*Ess : of Kingdoms*.

"How great the honor is to keep and defend the approaches and avenues of this kingdom."—*Advice to Essex*.

"We have ships and boats for going under water and brooking of seas."—*New Atlantis*.

"Whoever is Master of the Sea is Master of the Empire."—*De Augmentis*.

ERRATA.—In Miss Alicia Leith's article, "Something About Arundel House," which appeared in *BACONIANA*, April, 1914, p. 97, Canterbury Mansion should have been printed Canonbury Mansion. Also page 99, "Gilbert Sulbut's daughter" should be "Gilbert Talbot's." Both printer's errors occur in footnotes.